UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,878	07/09/2001	Giovanni Seni	LX00071	5935

20280 7590 01/05/2005

MOTOROLA INC
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45
ROOM AS437
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343

EXAMINER	
CHANG, JON CARLTON	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2623	

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/901,878	SENI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jon Chang	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *54-60* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *54-60* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Applicants' Amendment and Arguments

1. The amendment filed August 30, 2004, has been entered and made of record.

Applicant's arguments, see pages 5-6, filed August 30, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 54-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection are made in view of various references (see rejections below).

Applicants' arguments regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive for at least the following reasons. On page 4, Applicants state that Fig.1 shows an input area 104 having a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data for text recognition, while Fig.2 shows an input area having another window for a word correction board, and that no language in the present application states that the window for handwritten data is the same as the window for the word correction keyboard. However, the Examiner notes that no language in the original disclosure indicates that the area 104 has different windows in Figs. 1 and 2. In fact, **there is no language in the disclosure that the indicated portion in each figure is a window**.

Furthermore, the specification does not support Applicants' position that Figs. 1 and 2 show different embodiments (note paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5, especially the sentence bridging the pages and the text on page 5). For example, in the Brief Description of the Drawings, the description of Fig.1 refers to "a graphical handwriting user interface" and the description of Fig.2 refers to "the handwriting user interface."

This implies that the same handwriting user interface (and thus the same embodiment) are being shown in the Figs. 1 and 2. This is also supported in the detailed description portion of the specification. For example, on page 5, line 12, the specification states, "FIG.1 shows a preferred embodiment..." Page 9, line 5 of the specification states, "FIG.2 shows an example of the preferred embodiment HUI..." In other words, figures 1 and 2 are showing the same embodiment for the handwriting user interface.

Moreover, there is no description in the original disclosure which supports Applicant's statement, "...the input area 104 of FIGs. 1 and 2 are the same, but the windows may be different" (page 4, in the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5).

Additionally, even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the windows is **exclusively** for receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text (as in claim 54), how can the window at the same time include an action icon (as in claim 58)?

On page 7, first and second paragraphs, Applicants state that the "specification clearly describes the embodiment...in full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art...to make and use the same." The Examiner responds by pointing out that Applicants are referring to the enablement aspect of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. The rejection set forth by the Examiner was not an enablement rejection. Rather, it dealt with the written description requirement.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is deemed proper and will be maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 54-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 54 recites, "a circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text ..." This is not supported in the original disclosure. First, assuming that the input area 104 in Fig. 1, corresponds to the claimed "window" (although there is no discussion of this being a window), the specification further states, regarding Fig.2, "In this mode, the user interface displays a QWERTY keyboard 132 in the input area..." This language explicitly describes that the keyboard is displayed **in** the "window". This means that in Fig.2, the "window" still exists, with a keyboard inside of it. The only other possible interpretation of Applicants' disclosure, is that the "window" is the area below the horizontal line which separates areas 102 and 104 (Fig.1). Even with this interpretation, Fig.2 still indicates that the "window" has a keyboard displayed in it. Since a keyboard is presented in the "window," and utilized for input, the "window" is not "for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data for text recognition."

Second, page 11, at lines 13-15, the specification states, "In step 144, a check is made to determine when the handwritten entry is complete this is typically done with a timer, by pressing a space key or by a special pen gesture." Taking Applicants'

interpretation of "gesture" as evident in the prosecution history of this application, neither "pressing a space key" or a "pen gesture" would qualify as a "handwritten data corresponding to text."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 54 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,974,161 to York.

As to claim 54, York discloses a hand-held electronic apparatus comprising:

a touch-enabled screen configured to receive and display information (Figs. 2 or 3; (column 2, lines 31, 43-44 and 66-67; column 3, lines 1-2); and

a circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text, to recognize single and multiple character words based on the handwritten data receive and displayed in the window, and to restrict the window to a single location of the touch-enabled screen (column 3, lines 18-22).

As to claim 59, York discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window always appears at a specific location of the touch-enabled screen when activated (Figs. 2 or 3).

5. Claims 54-55 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,926,566 to Wang et al. (hereinafter "Wang").

As to claim 54, Wang discloses a hand-held electronic apparatus comprising:

a touch-enabled screen configured to receive and display information (column 5, lines 55 and 66-67; column 6, lines 11-12; column 11, lines 25-28; Fig.7); and

a circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text, to recognize single and multiple character words based on the handwritten data receive and displayed in the window, and to restrict the window to a single location of the touch-enabled screen (window comprising 34a and 34b, in Fig.7; column 11, lines 25-28; Fig.1, element 18).

Regarding to claim 55, Wang discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window is smaller in size than the touch-enabled screen (see Fig.7).

With regard to claim 59, Wang discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window always appears at a specific location of the touch-enabled screen when activated (Fig.7).

6. Claims 54-55 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,870,492 to Shimizu et al. (hereinafter "Shimizu").

As to claim 54, Shimizu discloses a hand-held electronic apparatus comprising:

a touch-enabled screen configured to receive and display information (column 3, lines 47, 54-58); and

a circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text, to recognize single and multiple character words based on the handwritten data receive and displayed in the window, and to restrict the window to a single location of the touch-enabled screen (column 4, lines 1-26; Figs.2 and 4(a); the window comprises a row of character boxes 17, for example).

Regarding claim 55, Shimizu discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window is smaller in size than the touch-enabled screen (Fig.2).

As to claim 59, Shimizu discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window always appears at a specific location of the touch-enabled screen when activated (Fig.2).

7. Claims 54, 55 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,052,482 to Arai et al. (hereinafter "Arai '482").

As to claim 54, Arai '482discloses a hand-held electronic apparatus comprising:

a touch-enabled screen configured to receive and display information (column 6, lines 16-28; Fig.1, elements 102a, 102 and 104); and

a circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying

handwritten data corresponding to text, to recognize single and multiple character words based on the handwritten data receive and displayed in the window, and to restrict the window to a single location of the touch-enabled screen (column 6, lines 4-5, 28-30 and 54-62; Fig.1; the window comprises the box surrounding the character input boxes).

As to claim 55, Arai '482 discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window is smaller in size than the touch-enabled screen (Fig.1).

Regarding claim 59, Arai '482 discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window always appears at a specific location of the touch-enabled screen when activated (Fig.1).

8. Claims 54-55 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,812,696 to Arai et al. (hereinafter "Arai '696").

As to claim 54, Arai '696 discloses a hand-held electronic apparatus comprising:

a touch-enabled screen configured to receive and display information (column 3, lines 4-5; Fig.1); and

a circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text, to recognize single and multiple character words based on the handwritten data receive and displayed in the window, and to restrict the window to a single location of the touch-enabled screen (column 3, lines 35-36; column 4, lines 20-22; Figs. 1 and 3; the window comprises frames 41-46, or the extent of element 12).

Regarding claim 55, Arai '696 discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window is smaller in size than the touch-enabled screen (Fig.3, the window corresponds to elements 41-46).

As to claim 59, Arai '696 discloses the hand-held electronic apparatus of claim 54, wherein the window always appears at a specific location of the touch-enabled screen when activated (Fig.1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 55-58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of York and U.S. Patent 5,838,302 to Kuriyama et al. (hereinafter "Kuriyama").

Regarding claim 55, York does not disclose that the window is smaller in size than the touch-enabled screen. However, the size of the window with respect to the touch-enabled screen is seen as based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a size for the window which meets a particular application or need. Furthermore, having a window smaller in size than the touch-enabled screen is well known in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches this (Figs.3B and 3C, area P). This provides the inherent advantage of allowing other areas of the screen to be used for other purposes, such as action icons (Kuriyama, Figs.3B or 3C, elements 31-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify York's invention according to Kuriyama.

As to claim 56, York does not disclose that the particular location of the window is a lower portion of the touch-enabled screen. However, the location of the window with respect to the touch-enabled screen is seen as based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular location for the window which meets a particular application or need, or based on the desires of users. Furthermore, having the location of a window in a lower portion of a touch-enabled screen is well known in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches (Figs.3B and 3C). This provides a more logical positioning of the window, as the lower portion of the screen is closer to the user. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify York's invention according to Kuriyama.

As to claim 57, neither York nor Kuriyama discloses that the window occupies less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spans a width of the touch-enabled screen. However, this is not considered to patentably distinguish the claim from the prior art. To have the window a particular size is a decision to be made based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular window size to accommodate a particular application, or achieve a particular look, or meet a specific application, for example. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize any window size, including less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spanning the width of the touch-enabled screen.

As to claim 58, York does not disclose that the window includes at least one action icon. However, this is well known in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches this (note elements 31, 32, 33 or 34 in Figs.3B or 3C). The use of action icons as taught by Kuriyama provide the inherent advantage of allowing an efficient way for a user to implement various functions, such as backspacing, entering a new line, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify York's invention according to Kuriyama.

With regard to claim 60, York does not disclose the window may appear on and disappear from the touch-enabled screen. However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Kuriyama (note that it disappears in the key-input process, Fig.3A, and appears in the handwriting input process, Figs.3B and 3C). This would provide the

inherent advantage of making most efficient use of screen real estate, allowing multiple functions for the same screen area(s). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify York's invention according to Kuriyama.

12. Claims 56-58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wang and Kuriyama.

As to claim 56, Wang does not disclose that the particular location of the window is a lower portion of the touch-enabled screen. However, the location of the window with respect to the touch-enabled screen is seen as based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular location for the window which meets a particular application or need, or based on the desires of users. Furthermore, having the location of a window in a lower portion of a touch-enabled screen is well known in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches (Figs.3B and 3C). This provides a more logical positioning of the window, as the lower portion of the screen is closer to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang's invention according to Kuriyama.

As to claim 57, neither Wang nor Kuriyama discloses that the window occupies less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spans a width of the touch-enabled screen. However, this is not considered to patentably distinguish the claim from the prior art. To have the window a particular size is a decision to be made based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular window size to accommodate a particular application, or achieve a particular look, or meet a specific application, for

example. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize any window size, including less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spanning the width of the touch-enabled screen.

As to claim 58, Wang discloses that the window includes at least one action icon (note for example, the action icons in the area 36, in Fig.7). Furthermore, this is well known elsewhere in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches this (note elements 31, 32, 33 or 34 in Figs.3B or 3C).

With regard to claim 60, Wang does not disclose the window may appear on and disappear from the touch-enabled screen. However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Kuriyama (note that it disappears in the key-input process, Fig.3A, and appears in the handwriting input process, Figs.3B and 3C). This would provide the inherent advantage of making most efficient use of screen real estate, allowing multiple functions for the same screen area(s). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wang's invention according to Kuriyama.

13. Claims 56-58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shimizu and Kuriyama.

As to claim 56, Shimizu does not disclose that the particular location of the window is a lower portion of the touch-enabled screen. However, the location of the window with respect to the touch-enabled screen is seen as based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular location for the window which meets a particular application or need, or based on the desires of users. Furthermore, having

the location of a window in a lower portion of a touch-enabled screen is well known in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches (Figs.3B and 3C). This provides a more logical positioning of the window, as the lower portion of the screen is closer to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shimizu's invention according to Kuriyama.

As to claim 57, neither Shimizu nor Kuriyama discloses that the window occupies less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spans a width of the touch-enabled screen. However, this is not considered to patentably distinguish the claim from the prior art. To have the window a particular size is a decision to be made based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular window size to accommodate a particular application, or achieve a particular look, or meet a specific application, for example. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize any window size, including less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spanning the width of the touch-enabled screen.

As to claim 58, Shimizu does not disclose that the window includes at least one action icon. However, this is well known in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches this (note elements 31, 32, 33 or 34 in Figs.3B or 3C). The use of action icons as taught by Kuriyama provide the inherent advantage of allowing an efficient way for a user to implement various functions, such as backspacing, entering a new line, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shimizu's invention according to Kuriyama.

With regard to claim 60, Shimizu does not disclose the window may appear on and disappear from the touch-enabled screen. However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Kuriyama (note that it disappears in the key-input process, Fig.3A, and appears in the handwriting input process, Figs.3B and 3C). This would provide the inherent advantage of making most efficient use of screen real estate, allowing multiple functions for the same screen area(s). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Shimizu's invention according to Kuriyama.

14. Claims 56-58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Arai '482 and Kuriyama.

As to claim 56, Arai '482 does not disclose that the particular location of the window is a lower portion of the touch-enabled screen. However, the location of the window with respect to the touch-enabled screen is seen as based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular location for the window which meets a particular application or need, or based on the desires of users. Furthermore, having the location of a window in a lower portion of a touch-enabled screen is well known in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches (Figs.3B and 3C). This provides a more logical positioning of the window, as the lower portion of the screen is closer to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arai '482's invention according to Kuriyama.

As to claim 57, neither Arai '482 nor Kuriyama discloses that the window occupies less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spans a width of the

touch-enabled screen. However, this is not considered to patentably distinguish the claim from the prior art. To have the window a particular size is a decision to be made based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular window size to accommodate a particular application, or achieve a particular look, or meet a specific application, for example. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize any window size, including less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spanning the width of the touch-enabled screen.

As to claim 58, Arai '482 discloses that the window includes at least one action icon (note for example, the action icons 431-435, in Fig.7). Furthermore, this is well known elsewhere in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches this (note elements 31, 32, 33 or 34 in Figs.3B or 3C).

With regard to claim 60, Arai '482 does not disclose the window may appear on and disappear from the touch-enabled screen. However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Kuriyama (note that it disappears in the key-input process, Fig.3A, and appears in the handwriting input process, Figs.3B and 3C). This would provide the inherent advantage of making most efficient use of screen real estate, allowing multiple functions for the same screen area(s). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arai '482's invention according to Kuriyama.

15. Claims 56-58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Arai '696 and Kuriyama.

As to claim 56, Arai '696 does not disclose that the particular location of the window is a lower portion of the touch-enabled screen. However, the location of the window with respect to the touch-enabled screen is seen as based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular location for the window which meets a particular application or need, or based on the desires of users. Furthermore, having the location of a window in a lower portion of a touch-enabled screen is well known in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches (Figs.3B and 3C). This provides a more logical positioning of the window, as the lower portion of the screen is closer to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arai '696's invention according to Kuriyama.

As to claim 57, neither Arai '696 nor Kuriyama discloses that the window occupies less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spans a width of the touch-enabled screen. However, this is not considered to patentably distinguish the claim from the prior art. To have the window a particular size is a decision to be made based on designer preference. A designer would utilize a particular window size to accommodate a particular application, or achieve a particular look, or meet a specific application, for example. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize any window size, including less than one third of the touch-enabled screen and spanning the width of the touch-enabled screen.

As to claim 58, Arai '696 discloses that the window includes at least one action icon (note for example, the action icon 47, in Fig.3). Furthermore, this is well known

elsewhere in the art. For example, Kuriyama teaches this (note elements 31, 32, 33 or 34 in Figs.3B or 3C).

With regard to claim 60, Arai '696 does not disclose the window may appear on and disappear from the touch-enabled screen. However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Kuriyama (note that it disappears in the key-input process, Fig.3A, and appears in the handwriting input process, Figs.3B and 3C). This would provide the inherent advantage of making most efficient use of screen real estate, allowing multiple functions for the same screen area(s). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arai '696's invention according to Kuriyama.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jon Chang whose telephone number is (703)305-8439. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on (703)308-6604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jon Chang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623

Jon Chang
January 4, 2005